

Decision \_\_\_\_\_

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to  
Continue Electric Integrated Resource  
Planning and Related Procurement  
Processes.

R. \_\_\_\_\_

**ORDER INSTITUTING RULEMAKING TO CONTINUE  
ELECTRIC INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLANNING AND  
RELATED PROCUREMENT PROCESSES**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
ORDER INSTITUTING RULEMAKING TO CONTINUE ELECTRIC INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLANNING AND RELATED PROCUREMENT PROCESSES .....	2
Summary .....	2
1. Background .....	3
2. Preliminary Scoping Memo .....	5
2.1. Planning Track .....	7
2.2. Procurement Track .....	9
2.3. Issues Not in Scope .....	10
3. Initial Schedule .....	11
4. Interagency Considerations .....	14
5. Invitation to Comment on Preliminary Scoping Memo and Schedule .....	16
6. Category of Proceeding; <i>Ex Parte</i> Communications; and Need for Hearing .....	17
7. Respondents .....	18
8. Service List .....	18
9. Subscription Service .....	19
10. Intervenor Compensation .....	19
11. Public Advisor .....	20

**Attachment A - List of Respondents and Contact Information**

**ORDER INSTITUTING RULEMAKING TO CONTINUE  
ELECTRIC INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLANNING AND  
RELATED PROCUREMENT PROCESSES**

**Summary**

This rulemaking continues the Commission's process for integrated resource planning (IRP) designed in Rulemaking (R.) 16-02-007 for implementation of Public Utilities Code Sections 454.51 and 454.52.<sup>1</sup> These code sections were originally created by Senate Bill (SB) 350 (DeLeón, 2015); SB 100 (DeLeón, 2018) has since been enacted, setting additional environmental goals for the electricity sector. As a successor docket to R.16-02-007, this proceeding will address ongoing oversight of the IRP planning process and the procurement necessary to achieve the goals set by the Legislature in SB 350 and SB 100, as well as by the Commission in R.16-02-007.

This proceeding also serves as the umbrella venue for considering comprehensive issues in the portion of the California electricity sector under the purview of the Commission, including coordination with activities and policies in specific resource areas, including, but not limited to, energy efficiency, demand response, renewables, storage, transmission, and conventional generation resources. Coordination with the resource adequacy program is an important component of this proceeding as well.

This is also the venue for considering the bundled procurement plans and procurement rules applicable to the large investor-owned utilities (IOUs).

We will also continue our collaboration with other relevant entities, including the California Energy Commission and their Integrated Energy Policy

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to code sections in this Order Instituting Rulemaking are to the Public Utilities Code, unless otherwise noted.

Report, the California Independent System Operator's Transmission Planning Process, the California Air Resources Board's Scoping Plan for greenhouse gas emissions reductions under the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (also known as Assembly Bill (AB) 32 (Nunez, 2006), and once-through cooling policies for power plants implemented by the State Water Resources Control Board.

This order closes R.16-02-007 for purposes of Section § 1701.5. R.16-02-007 remains open only to consider pending intervenor compensation claims and a petition for modification filed by the California Energy Storage Alliance on April 1, 2020. The record of R.16-02-007 is incorporated into the new rulemaking and any other outstanding motions are denied.

Parties are invited to comment on this OIR and its initial proposed scope within 30 days of the issuance of this rulemaking. Reply comments may be filed within 45 days.

## **1. Background**

This proceeding is the successor to Rulemaking (R.) 16-02-007, which itself was a successor to multiple long-term procurement planning (LTPP) proceedings, including R.13-12-010, R.12-03-014, R.10-05-006, R.08-02-007, R.04-04-003, and R.01-10-024.

The first major decision in R.16-02-007, Decision (D.) 18-02-018, established the IRP process, designed to be repeated every two years, with the first year devoted to development by the Commission of a modeled optimal electric resource portfolio for the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) system (referred to as the Reference System Portfolio or RSP). The second year was designed to be dedicated to considering the individual and aggregated IRP filings of the load-serving entities (LSEs) serving electric load in California under

the Commission's IRP purview, resulting in a Preferred System Portfolio (PSP). The PSP was designed to take into account the resource preferences of individual LSEs. The first PSP was adopted in D.19-04-040.

Both the RSP and the PSP, in successive years, were designed to be used by the CAISO in its annual Transmission Planning Process (TPP). Both also rely on assumptions from the California Energy Commission's (CEC's) Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR) process, including, most importantly, the demand forecast.

In R.16-02-007, the Commission also instituted a procurement track of the proceeding, designed to address procurement actions that LSEs need to take within the next few years to ensure near-term reliability, as well as procure the resources needed for achieving the longer-term goals out to at least 2030.

D.19-11-016, the first decision emanating from the procurement track, found that there were significant system reliability needs between 2021 and 2023, and required all LSEs to procure resource adequacy capacity to ensure reliability in that timeframe.

In addition, as originally set up under the long-term procurement planning (LTPP) process, the investor-owned utilities (IOUs) are responsible for submitting procurement plans that project their resource needs for their bundled customers, and their action plans for meeting those needs, over a ten-year horizon. The bundled plans are distinct from IRPs in that they get into more analytical and cost-based analysis of procurement risks and instruments. Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 57,<sup>2</sup> codified as Public Utilities Code Section

---

<sup>2</sup> AB 57 (Stats. 2002, Ch. 850, Sec 3, effective September 24, 2002) added Public Utilities Code Section 454.5

454.5, the Commission establishes up-front standards for the investor-owned utilities' (IOUs') procurement activities and cost recovery by reviewing and approving procurement plans. This obviates the need for the Commission to conduct after-the-fact reasonableness reviews for the resulting utility procurement transactions that are in compliance with the upfront standards established in the approved bundled procurement plans.

## **2. Preliminary Scoping Memo**

As required by Rule 7.1(d)<sup>3</sup> of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules), this Order includes a preliminary scoping memo. In this Preliminary Scoping Memo, we describe the issues to be considered in this proceeding and the timetable for resolving the proceeding. In response to this rulemaking order, parties will have the opportunity to provide preliminary comments on the issues raised. After a prehearing conference (PHC), an Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Ruling will be issued laying out the issues and procedural path in greater detail.

As in the previous IRP and earlier long-term procurement planning (LTPP) proceedings, our work in this proceeding will serve as a kind of "umbrella" for our work in a number of related proceedings and policy areas. We will continue to coordinate, as necessary, with the proceedings addressing specific resource areas, including, but not limited to, energy efficiency, demand response, integrated distributed energy resources, energy storage, renewables portfolio standard, transmission resources, and resource adequacy. Integrated resource

---

<sup>3</sup> "An order instituting rulemaking shall preliminarily determine the category and need for hearing, and shall attach a preliminary scoping memo. The preliminary determination is not appealable, but shall be confirmed or changes by assigned Commissioner's ruling [ACR] pursuant to Rule 7.3, and such ruling as to category is subject to appeal under Rule 7.6." (Rule 7.1(d).)

planning and procurement issues relate to a number of different Commission proceedings, including, but not limited to, those listed in Table 1 below.

**Table 1. Procurement-Related Proceedings**

	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Proceeding Number</b>
1	Greenhouse Gas Proceeding for Electric Utilities	R.11-03-012
2	Greenhouse Gas Proceeding for Gas Utilities	R.14-03-003
3	Climate Adaptation	R.18-04-019
4	Resource Adequacy Requirements	R.17-09-020 and R.19-11-009
5	Energy Efficiency	R.13-11-005
6	Demand Response	R.13-09-011 and A.17-01-012 et al.
7	Net Energy Metering	R.14-07-002
8	Evaluation of Integrated Distributed Energy Resource Programs	R.14-10-003
9	Distribution Resources Plan Rulemaking	R.14-08-013
10	California Solar Initiative and Distributed Generation	R.12-11-005
11	Renewables Portfolio Standard Program	R.18-07-003 and R.15-02-020
12	Energy Storage	A.20-03-002 et al.
13	Transportation Electrification	R.18-12-006
14	Electric Program Investment Charge (EPIC) Research and Development	R.19-10-005

In addition, this proceeding will be the primary venue for ongoing Commission coordination with the CEC's IEPR process, the CAISO TPP, the Scoping Plan and Emissions Inventory processes of the California Air Resources Board (CARB), and the once-through-cooling policies for power plant cooling of the State Water Resources Control Board (Water Board).

As in R.16-02-007, we intend to divide this proceeding into two main tracks proceeding in parallel: a planning track and a procurement track. These two tracks are described further below.

## **2.1. Planning Track**

In this track of the proceeding, similar to R.16-02-007, the Commission will continue to consider all work associated with the development and adoption of the RSP and the PSP. This includes issues related to:

- Inputs and assumptions for modeling to assess optimal portfolios, as well as aggregated LSE portfolios, including resource cost and availability assumptions;
- Resource valuation and/or selection methodology;
- Choice of models and modeling techniques;
- Model calibration techniques;
- GHG targets and individual LSE GHG benchmarks;
- Load forecasting issues;
- Choices of scenarios and sensitivities for analysis;
- Methodologies for geographic busbar mapping of portfolios for TPP purposes;
- Reliability, cost, GHG emissions, and criteria air pollutant analyses;
- Impacts on disadvantaged communities;
- Filing requirements for individual IRPs;
- Ensuring reasonable costs and minimizing bill impacts;
- Relationship of the electricity sector to other sectors, including but not limited to industry, transportation, and buildings;
- Compliance with all provisions of §454.51 and §454.52 and SB 100; and
- Compliance and enforcement related to all IRP requirements.

We expect that the work on the planning track of this proceeding will involve planning out beyond 2030, which has been the focus on the first two IRP



planning cycles. In this proceeding, we will need to move beyond 2030 toward at least 2035, in preparation for the 2045 goals of SB 100.

SB 100 work has already been occurring in interagency venues in parallel with R.16-02-007. This proceeding will be the ongoing venue for handling any planning and/or procurement necessary to meet SB 100 goals.

We also note that the Commission has, in the context of the renewables portfolio standard (RPS) proceeding requirements, expressed interest in closer coordination and consolidation of RPS planning efforts with those of IRP. This proceeding will also be the venue for considering the IRP-related portions of that work.

Further, we note that the two-year structure of the IRP planning process established in D.18-02-018 has proven to be a challenge to maintain, both for the Commission and for interested parties, because of the large amount of work associated with the development and adoption of both the RSP and the PSP. As such, this proceeding will be the venue for consideration of potential changes to the overall schedule or structure of the two-year cycle, to reduce the burden on all parties while maintaining timely exchange of essential deliverables with the annual TPP process and utilizing the most recent outputs from the IEPR annual process.

As the first priority for the planning track, however, we will need to develop the next PSP, based on the individual IRP filings of the LSEs in 2020. As required by D.20-03-028, all LSEs will provide the Commission with portfolios that meet their proportional share of a statewide electric sector 46 million metric ton (MMT) GHG target in 2030, as well as a 38 MMT GHG target in 2030.

Commission staff will aggregate the portfolios of all LSEs, and conduct further feasibility, reliability, cost, and emissions analysis on those portfolios.

Because the individual IRP filings will come in later in 2020, it is unlikely that the portfolios can be aggregated, analyzed, and adopted in time to inform the CAISO 2021-22 TPP cycle. Thus, the Commission will need to evaluate what portfolios should be recommended to the CAISO for the next TPP analysis. It is possible that the current RSP being analyzed in this year's TPP as a sensitivity may be ready to form a base case by the next TPP, or additional information from the previous TPP may be used to develop an alternative portfolio recommendation. This issue will be further developed in the first part of this new rulemaking, in order to inform recommendations for the 2021-22 TPP.

In addition, the individual IRPs will be analyzed for whether they should form the basis for any related procurement requirements for LSEs in the near and medium term.

## **2.2. Procurement Track**

As in R.16-02-007, we intend to consider procurement-related issues in parallel with IRP planning. The procurement track of the proceeding will be the place to evaluate procurement actions necessary to be required of LSEs for reasons of system reliability or achievement of other requirements of SB 350 or SB 100.

In this proceeding and the procurement track, we will primarily evaluate reliability issues at the system level, as well as evaluating the need for renewable integration or flexible resources. Local reliability issues will continue to be addressed primarily in the resource adequacy proceeding (currently R.17-09-020 and R.19-11-009).

There is some potential for overlap between issues being considered in the resource adequacy rulemakings and those that will require consideration here. For example, while the resource adequacy proceedings are currently considering

issues related to a centralized procurement entity for procurement of local resource adequacy resources, there may be models or parallels to be considered in this proceeding with respect to system-level reliability.

In addition, as already initiated in D.19-11-016 emanating from the procurement track of R.16-02-007, we will continue ongoing consideration in this proceeding of the cost allocation policies associated with procurement ordered out of this proceeding. This may include allocating additional responsibility for procurement, in the event that some LSEs either opt out of procuring on behalf of their own customers, or intend to procure, but fail to procure successfully.

Also in this proceeding, we will continue to consider procurement issues associated with long lead-time resources, such as long-duration storage, offshore wind, and out-of-state renewables, and other resources that add portfolio diversity, such as geothermal. In addition, we will examine issues associated with resources whose development may require involvement of multiple LSEs in order to be viable. We may also examine procurement issues associated with the development of new resource types, such as hybrid resources or hydrogen-fueled resources.

Finally, as mentioned earlier, this proceeding generally, and the procurement track specifically, will be the venue for consideration of utility bundled procurement plans, including any necessary changes to the most recent approved bundled plans.

### **2.3. Issues Not in Scope**

We recognize the potential that this proceeding, as the umbrella proceeding for procurement, may attract “forum shopping” proposals from parties that have had their ideas rejected, or have yet to be considered, in other proceedings. As in the predecessor proceeding, the Commission finds it

necessary to adopt a scoping standard for this proceeding, in order to highlight what constitutes an issue that is legitimately in the scope in this proceeding. At the same time, we recognize that with the passage of SB 350 and SB 100, the lines between these proceedings may become less clear in the future. Nonetheless, we intend that all of these proceedings will move forward separately, and that we may begin to consolidate and combine proceedings only after separately considering the SB 350 and SB 100 procurement implications in this and other proceedings.

*Scoping Standard.* The scoping standard for this proceeding is defined as follows:

- Any procurement-related issue(s) not already considered in other procurement-related dockets expressly listed in Section 2, Table 1 (or other dockets opened in the future to cover procurement-related issues) may be considered, subject to the following conditions. The issue(s) must:
  - (1) Materially impact procurement policies, practices, and/or procedures;
  - (2) Be narrowly defined; and
  - (3) Demonstrate consistency with one or more of the IRP proceeding goals.

Therefore, issues that do not meet this standard *will not be* in the scope of this proceeding.

### **3. Initial Schedule**

Within 30 days of the adoption of this OIR, we request that parties file comments on the Preliminary Scoping Memo contained herein. Reply comments may be filed 15 days later. A prehearing conference (PHC) will also be scheduled for shortly after the period for comments and replies has elapsed. The

PHC may be telephonic to accommodate the need for social distancing related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

### Preliminary Schedule

Proceeding Milestone	Date
Comments on OIR filed and served	30 days after OIR issuance
Reply comments on OIR filed and served	45 days after OIR issuance
Prehearing Conference	3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2020
Scoping Ruling	3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2020
Planning Track	
Individual IRPs due from LSEs	September 1, 2020
ALJ ruling seeking comments on objectives and design of portfolios for 2021-22 TPP, possibly including additional information on busbar mapping methodology	September 2020
Comments and replies in response to ALJ TPP ruling	October 2020
Proposed decision with 2021-22 TPP recommendations	January 2021
Workshop on individual IRP aggregation results	February 2021
Workshop presenting staff modeling results	April 2021
ALJ ruling seeking comment on PSP recommendations	April 2021
Comments and replies on ALJ ruling on PSP recommendations, including parties' modeling results	June 2021
Possible additional process around PSP development	Late Summer 2021
Proposed decision adopting PSP	Fall 2021
Other issues	To be determined

Proceeding Milestone	Date
<b>Procurement Track</b>	
ALJ ruling seeking comments on cost allocation and backstop procurement issues emanating from D.19-11-016	May 2020
Comments and replies on ALJ ruling on cost allocation and backstop procurement issues	June 2020
Development of options for procurement framework of long lead-time and/or large-scale resources, possibly including additional analysis on specific resource types	Summer 2020
Staff assessment of near-medium-term reliability status, comparing individual IRP resource plans to system needs between 2023 and 2026	Late Fall 2020
ALJ ruling seeking comments on staff assessment of near-medium-term reliability status and potential procurement needs	Late Fall 2020
ALJ ruling seeking comment on procurement framework for long lead-time and/or large-scale resources, and possibly including procurement direction as a result of analysis of specific resource types	Late Fall 2020
Comments and replies on ALJ ruling(s) on resource procurement	Winter 2020-2021
Proposed decision on cost allocation and backstop procurement issues, as well as near-medium-term procurement needs, if identified	Spring 2021
Other issues	To be determined

Each of the issue areas outlined in the Preliminary Scoping Memo will likely require different types and degrees of public participation. Therefore, we delegate further definition of procedure and schedule for each issue area to the assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) as determined in the Scoping Ruling or a later ruling. We leave open the possibility that issue areas may be decided upon individually in interim decisions, if necessary, as indicated in the preliminary schedule above.

In addition, we authorize the assigned Commissioner and/or ALJ to organize issues within the proceeding, including creating additional tracks for organization. The assigned Commissioner or ALJ has the authority to make any and all necessary changes to the above schedule.

This proceeding will conform to the statutory case management deadline for quasi-legislative matters set forth in § 1701.5. In particular, it is our intention to resolve all relevant issues within 36 months of the date this OIR is adopted. In using the authority granted in § 1701.5(b) to set a time longer than 18 months, we consider the number and complexity of the tasks and the need to coordinate with multiple other proceedings. This timeframe is also intended to allow us to complete at least one additional IRP cycle within this proceeding, such that by the time the proceeding is complete, we will have finished at least two complete IRP cycles.

In addition, there will likely be multiple workshops and/or webinars in this proceeding. Notice of such workshops or webinars will be noticed to the service list of this proceeding and posted on the Commission's Daily Calendar to inform the public that a decisionmaker or an advisor may be present at those meetings or workshops. Parties should check the Daily Calendar regularly for such notices.

#### **4. Interagency Considerations**

In D.04-01-050, the Commission established that LTPP proceedings would occur on a biennial basis. This approach was to ensure appropriate coordination with the CEC's IEPR proceeding.<sup>4</sup> The Commission kept the same type of biennial structure for IRP in D.18-02-018. We will consider the CEC's most recent

---

<sup>4</sup> D.04-01-050 at 175.

IEPR for procurement-related recommendations during this and related rulemakings,<sup>5</sup> and will also take into consideration the SB 350 requirements for the CEC to establish annual targets that will achieve a cumulative doubling of statewide energy efficiency savings by 2030.

In addition, SB 350 requires us to meet the greenhouse gas reduction targets established by CARB for the electricity sector. Thus, we will also need close collaboration with CARB in this proceeding.

We have also found in R.16-02-007, the necessity for ongoing collaboration and cooperation with the Water Board with respect to policies related to once-through cooling for powerplants.

In recent years, we have welcomed the active participation of the CEC in our rulemaking endeavors on the decision-making side, rather than as a party to the proceeding. We invite the CEC, CARB, and Water Board to continue to join us in this proceeding by continuing the collaborative approach that the CEC and this Commission have pursued in the development of procurement policy since R.05-12-013, and most recently in R.16-02-007.

In addition, the Commission has worked cooperatively with the CAISO on matters that directly impact long-term procurement, including operational flexibility modeling, transmission planning, and wholesale market issues. We welcome and invite the CAISO's participation as a party to this proceeding to provide data and analysis to develop the record of this proceeding.

Given the compelling need to collaborate and coordinate across the distinct planning efforts occurring at the CPUC, CEC, CAISO, and CARB, we

---

<sup>5</sup> CEC. *Energy Policies*. See [https://ww2.energy.ca.gov/2019\\_energypolicy/](https://ww2.energy.ca.gov/2019_energypolicy/)



seek to further integrate and align this proceeding with the CEC's IEPR proceeding, the CAISO's TPP, and the CARB Scoping Plan.

Toward that end, and to the extent necessary given the changing procurement landscape, we will coordinate our efforts in this proceeding with the CEC and CAISO to establish common assumptions, scenarios, and electricity portfolios for use in coordination with the IEPR and TPP. This is in keeping with the process alignment commitments we have made in previous LTPP proceedings.<sup>6</sup>

## **5. Invitation to Comment on Preliminary Scoping Memo and Schedule**

This Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) serves as a solicitation for parties to comment on the Preliminary Scoping Memo and issues identified in this document.

In particular, we invite parties to comment on:

- The appropriateness (or lack thereof) of items included in the preliminary scope of this proceeding;
- Whether there are additional items that should be included in the scope of this proceeding; and
- The appropriate prioritization or sequencing of topics and activities that should be handled in this proceeding leading to Commission decision(s).

Initial comments are due to be filed and served no later than 30 days after issuance of this rulemaking, with reply comments 15 days later. The Commission will utilize parties' comments and a PHC, to be scheduled, as a basis to identify areas that need clarification, and may consider the addition of

---

<sup>6</sup> See <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/General.aspx?id=6617>.

specific issues or questions related to the items described in Section 2 on the scope of this proceeding, pursuant to the guidance set forth herein.

We direct parties to limit their comments to the specific issues set forth in this OIR, as well as to objections to the preliminary determinations below. Comments are limited to no more than 25 pages per party, with replies limited to 15 pages per party.

**6. Category of Proceeding; *Ex Parte* Communications; and Need for Hearing**

The Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure require that an OIR preliminarily determine the category of the proceeding and the need for hearing.<sup>7</sup> As a preliminary matter, we determine that this proceeding is categorized as ratesetting, as defined in Rule 1.3(e), because in the procurement track of this proceeding, we may consider and approve procurement that affects utility costs and therefore rates. Accordingly, *ex parte* communications are restricted and must be reported pursuant to Article 8 of the Rules.

We are also required to preliminarily determine if hearings are necessary. We preliminarily determine that hearings may be necessary. As with the earlier IRP proceeding, certain issues may lend themselves to resolution through a combination of workshops and/or formal comments without hearings.

Any person who objects to the preliminary categorization of this rulemaking as ratesetting or to the preliminary hearing determination shall state their objections in the comments on the Rulemaking. After considering the comments, the assigned Commissioner will issue a scoping ruling making a final

---

<sup>7</sup> Rule 7.1(a).

category determination; this final category determination is subject to appeal as specified in Rule 7.6.

## **7. Respondents**

All CPUC-jurisdictional electricity load serving entities, including Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, all small and multi-jurisdictional utilities, all electric cooperatives, and all operating community choice aggregators and electric service providers are respondents to this proceeding. The complete list of current respondents is contained in Attachment A. Within 15 days of mailing of this rulemaking, each respondent shall inform the Commission's Process Office of the contact information for a single representative; other representatives and persons affiliated with the respondents may be placed on the Information Only service list.

## **8. Service List**

This OIR shall be served on all Respondents and on the service list for the previous rulemaking, R.16-02-007.

Service of the OIR does not confer party status or place any person who has received such service on the Official Service List for this proceeding, other than respondents.

Addition to the official service list is governed by Rule 1.9(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Respondents are parties to the proceeding (*see* Rule 1.4(d)) and shall notify the Process Office of the named representative within 15 days of the mailing of this document, as discussed above in Section 6.

Any person will be added to the "Information Only" category of the official service list upon request, for electronic service of all documents in the

proceeding, and should do so promptly in order to ensure timely service of comments and other documents and correspondence in the proceeding.

(See Rule 1.9(f).) The request must be sent to the Commission's Process Office by e-mail ([Process\\_Office@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Process_Office@cpuc.ca.gov)) or letter (Process Office, California Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102). Please include the Docket Number of this Rulemaking in the request.

Persons who file responsive comments become parties to the proceeding (see Rule 1.4(a)(2)) and will be added to the "Parties" category of the official service list upon such filing. In order to assure service of comments and other documents and correspondence in advance of obtaining party status, persons should promptly request addition to the "Information Only" category as described above; they will be removed from that category upon obtaining party status.

## **9. Subscription Service**

Persons may monitor the proceeding by subscribing to receive electronic copies of documents in this proceeding that are published on the Commission's website. There is no need to be on the official service list in order to use the subscription service. Instructions for enrolling in the subscription service are available on the Commission's website at: <http://subscribe.puc.ca.gov/>.

## **10. Intervenor Compensation**

Intervenor Compensation is permitted in this proceeding. Any party that expects to claim intervenor compensation for its participation in this rulemaking shall file its notice of intent to claim intervenor compensation within 30 days after the filing of reply comments, except that notice may be filed within 30 days of a prehearing conference as well. (See Rule 17.1(a)(2).) Intervenor compensation rules are governed by Section 1801 et seq. of the Public Utilities

Code. Parties new to participating in Commission proceedings may contact the Commission's Public Advisor.

Parties who were previously found eligible to request compensation in R.16-02-007 shall remain eligible in this proceeding and do not need to file an NOI within 30 days, provided there are no material changes in their by-laws or financial status. Contributions made during the pendency of R.16-02-007 to issues within the scope of this proceeding may be considered for compensation in this proceeding, if not already compensated in R.16-02-007.

#### **11. Public Advisor**

Any person or entity interested in participating in this rulemaking who is unfamiliar with the Commission's procedures should contact the Commission's Public Advisor in San Francisco at (415) 703-2074 or 1-(866) 849-8390, or e-mail [public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov). The TTY number is 1-(866) 836-7825.

### **O R D E R**

**IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. The Commission institutes this rulemaking on its own motion to continue its ongoing efforts to conduct integrated resource planning and procurement for electricity resources.
2. All load-serving entities subject to Public Utilities Code Section 454.51 and 454.52 shall be respondents to this proceeding.
3. This is a successor proceeding to Rulemaking 16-02-007, with respect to integrated resource plans, and the record developed in that proceeding is fully available for consideration in this proceeding.
4. The Executive Director shall cause this Order Instituting Rulemaking to be served on the respondents listed in Attachment A of this Order, and on the

service lists for all proceedings listed in Section 2, Table 1, of this order, as replicated below:

#	Topic	Proceeding Number
1	Greenhouse Gas Proceeding for Electric Utilities	R.11-03-012
2	Greenhouse Gas Proceeding for Gas Utilities	R.14-03-003
3	Climate Adaptation	R.18-04-019
4	Resource Adequacy Requirements	R.17-09-020 and R.19-11-009
5	Energy Efficiency	R.13-11-005
6	Demand Response	R.13-09-011 and A.17-01-012 et al.
7	Net Energy Metering	R.14-07-002
8	Evaluation of Integrated Distributed Energy Resource Programs	R.14-10-003
9	Distribution Resources Plan Rulemaking	R.14-08-013
10	California Solar Initiative and Distributed Generation	R.12-11-005
11	Renewables Portfolio Standard Program	R.18-07-003 and R.15-02-020
12	Energy Storage	A.20-03-002 et al.
13	Transportation Electrification	R.18-12-006
14	Electric Program Investment Charge (EPIC) Research and Development	R.19-10-005

5. Respondents, parties, and/or prospective parties may file and serve comments on the preliminary scope of this proceeding outlined in this document by no later than 30 days after the issuance of this order. Pursuant to Rule 6.2 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, parties shall include in their comments any objections regarding the category, need for hearing, issues to be considered, or schedule. Comments shall be limited to no more than 25 pages per party. Reply comments may be filed and served no later than 45 days after the issuance of this order and shall be limited to no more than 15 pages per party.

6. Any person or representative of an entity interested in participating in or monitoring this proceeding that does not make an appearance at the prehearing conference shall follow the process for doing so set forth herein.

7. The category of this rulemaking is preliminarily determined to be ratesetting and is subject to the *ex parte* communication rules stated in Article 8 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

8. Evidentiary hearings are preliminarily determined to be needed.

9. Any party that expects to claim intervenor compensation for its participation in this rulemaking shall file its notice of intent to claim intervenor compensation no later than 30 days after the due date for reply comments; notices may also be filed 30 days after the prehearing conference. Parties who were previously found eligible to request compensation in Rulemaking (R.) 16-02-007 shall remain eligible in this proceeding and do not need to file a notice of intent within 30 days, provided there are no material changes in their by-laws or financial status. Contributions made during the pendency of R.16-02-007 to issues within the scope of this proceeding may be considered for compensation in this proceeding, if not already compensated in R.16-02-007.

10. All outstanding motions in Rulemaking 16-02-007 are hereby denied.

11. Rulemaking 16-02-007 is resolved for the purpose of Public Utilities Code Section 1701.5(a) requirements, but it will remain open to address a Petition for Modification filed on April 1, 2020 by the California Energy Storage Alliance, as well as intervenor compensation claims.

12. The assigned Commissioner or Administrative Law Judge may make any revisions to the scheduling and filing determinations made herein as necessary to facilitate the efficient management of the proceeding, including organization of issues into additional tracks of the proceeding.

This order is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at San Francisco, California.



**Attachment A – List of Respondents and Contact Information**

**Note:** This list was developed largely based on the designated party representative on the service list for Rulemaking 16-02-007. If the entity listed prefers to list a different primary representative for the new proceeding, they should contact the Commission's Process Office by email at [Process\\_Office@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Process_Office@cpuc.ca.gov), to designate the single party representative for the service list. Additional names can be included on the service list with the "Information Only" designation.

	Load Serving Entity	Representative Name	Email Contact
<b>Investor Owned Utilities</b>			
1	Bear Valley Electric Service	Jedediah J. Gibson	<a href="mailto:jjg@eslawfirm.com">jjg@eslawfirm.com</a>
2	Liberty Utilities	Daniel Marsh	<a href="mailto:Dan.Marsh@libertyutilities.com">Dan.Marsh@libertyutilities.com</a>
3	Pacific Gas and Electric	Tyson R. Smith	<a href="mailto:TRSN@pge.com">TRSN@pge.com</a>
4	PacifiCorp	Jessica Buno Ralston	<a href="mailto:Jessica.Ralston@PacifiCorp.com">Jessica.Ralston@PacifiCorp.com</a>
5	San Diego Gas & Electric	Aimee Smith	<a href="mailto:AmSmith@SempraUtilities.com">AmSmith@SempraUtilities.com</a>
6	Southern California Edison	Cathy A. Karlstad	<a href="mailto:Cathy.Karlstad@sce.com">Cathy.Karlstad@sce.com</a>
<b>Community Choice Aggregators</b>			
7	Apple Valley Choice Energy	Kofi Antobam	<a href="mailto:kantobam@applevalley.org">kantobam@applevalley.org</a>
8	Baldwin Park, City of	Jean M. Ayala	<a href="mailto:jayala@baldwinpark.com">jayala@baldwinpark.com</a>
9	Butte Choice Energy	Brian Ring	<a href="mailto:bring@buttecounty.net">bring@buttecounty.net</a>
10	Clean Energy Alliance	Barbara Boswell	<a href="mailto:Barbara@BayshoreCGI.com">Barbara@BayshoreCGI.com</a>
11	Clean Power Alliance of Southern California	Ryan M. Baron	<a href="mailto:Ryan.Baron@bbklaw.com">Ryan.Baron@bbklaw.com</a>
12	CleanPowerSF	Barbara Hale	<a href="mailto:BHale@SFWater.org">BHale@SFWater.org</a>
13	Commerce, City of	Vilko Domic	<a href="mailto:vilkod@ci.commerce.ca.us">vilkod@ci.commerce.ca.us</a>
14	Desert Community Energy	Ryan M. Baron	<a href="mailto:Ryan.Baron@bbklaw.com">Ryan.Baron@bbklaw.com</a>
15	East Bay Community Energy	Melissa Brandt	<a href="mailto:MBrandt@ebce.org">MBrandt@ebce.org</a>
16	King City Community Power	Thomas R. Darton	<a href="mailto:Regulatory@PilotPowerGroup.com">Regulatory@PilotPowerGroup.com</a>

	Load Serving Entity	Representative Name	Email Contact
17	Lancaster Choice Energy	Cathy DeFalco	<a href="mailto:cDeFalco@CityofLancasterCa.org">cDeFalco@CityofLancasterCa.org</a>
18	Marin Clean Energy	C.C. Song	<a href="mailto:CSong@mceCleanEnergy.org">CSong@mceCleanEnergy.org</a>
19	Monterey Bay Community Power	Peter Pearson	<a href="mailto:PPearson@MBCommunityPower.org">PPearson@MBCommunityPower.org</a>
20	Palmdale, City of	Barbara Boswell	<a href="mailto:Barbara@BayshoreCGI.com">Barbara@BayshoreCGI.com</a>
21	Peninsula Clean Energy Authority	Vidhya Prabhakaran	<a href="mailto:VidhyaPrabhakaran@dwt.com">VidhyaPrabhakaran@dwt.com</a>
22	Pico Rivera Innovative Municipal Energy	Katherine Hernandez	<a href="mailto:KHernandez@Pico-Rivera.org">KHernandez@Pico-Rivera.org</a>
23	Pioneer Community Energy	Scott Blaising	<a href="mailto:Blaising@BraunLegal.com">Blaising@BraunLegal.com</a>
24	Pomona, City of	Barbara Boswell	<a href="mailto:Barbara@BayshoreCGI.com">Barbara@BayshoreCGI.com</a>
25	Rancho Mirage Energy Authority	Isaiah Hagerman	<a href="mailto:IsaiahH@RanchoMirageCA.gov">IsaiahH@RanchoMirageCA.gov</a>
26	Redwood Coast Energy Authority	Richard Engel	<a href="mailto:REngel@RedwoodEnergy.org">REngel@RedwoodEnergy.org</a>
27	San Diego Community Power	Ty Tosdal	<a href="mailto:Ty@TosdalLaw.com">Ty@TosdalLaw.com</a>
28	San Jacinto Power	Robert Johnson	<a href="mailto:CityManager@SanJacintoCa.us">CityManager@SanJacintoCa.us</a>
29	San Jose Clean Energy	Jeanne Sole	<a href="mailto:Jeanne.sole@sanjoseca.gov">Jeanne.sole@sanjoseca.gov</a>
30	Santa Barbara Clean Energy	Barbara Boswell	<a href="mailto:barbara@calchoice.org">barbara@calchoice.org</a>
31	Silicon Valley Clean Energy	Scott Blaising	<a href="mailto:Blaising@BraunLegal.com">Blaising@BraunLegal.com</a>
32	Solana Energy Alliance	Ty Tosdal	<a href="mailto:Ty@TosdalLaw.com">Ty@TosdalLaw.com</a>
33	Sonoma Clean Power Authority	Neal M. Reardon	<a href="mailto:NReardon@SonomaCleanPower.org">NReardon@SonomaCleanPower.org</a>
34	Valley Clean Energy Alliance	Sheridan Pauker	<a href="mailto:SPauker@KeyesFox.com">SPauker@KeyesFox.com</a>
35	Western Community Energy	Ryan M. Baron	<a href="mailto:Ryan.Baron@bbklaw.com">Ryan.Baron@bbklaw.com</a>
<b>Electric Service Providers</b>			
36	3 Phases Renewables, Inc.	Michael Mazur	<a href="mailto:MMazur@3phasesRenewables.com">MMazur@3phasesRenewables.com</a>
37	Agera Energy, LLC	Kathryn Perry	<a href="mailto:CustomerCare@AgeraEnergy.com">CustomerCare@AgeraEnergy.com</a>
38	American PowerNet Management, L.P.	Linda J	<a href="mailto:LindaJ@AmericanPowerNet.com">LindaJ@AmericanPowerNet.com</a>
39	Calpine Energy Solutions, LLC	Greg Bass	<a href="mailto:Greg.Bass@CalpineSolutions.com">Greg.Bass@CalpineSolutions.com</a>
40	Calpine Power America-CA, LLC	Jason Armenta	<a href="mailto:JArmenta@calpine.com">JArmenta@calpine.com</a>

	Load Serving Entity	Representative Name	Email Contact
41	Commercial Energy of CA	Patrick VanBeek	<a href="mailto:Patrick.Vanbeek@CommercialEnergy.net">Patrick.Vanbeek@CommercialEnergy.net</a>
42	Constellation NewEnergy, Inc.	Pardeep Gill	<a href="mailto:Pardeep.Gill@Constellation.com">Pardeep.Gill@Constellation.com</a>
43	Direct Energy Business, LLC	Scott Olson	<a href="mailto:Scott.Olson@DirectEnergy.com">Scott.Olson@DirectEnergy.com</a>
44	EDF Industrial Power Services (CA), LLC	Byron Pollard	<a href="mailto:Byron.Pollard@EDFTrading.com">Byron.Pollard@EDFTrading.com</a>
45	Gexa Energy California, LLC	John H. Ritch	<a href="mailto:John.Ritch@GexaEnergy.com">John.Ritch@GexaEnergy.com</a>
46	Just Energy Solutions, Inc.	Inger Goodman	<a href="mailto:iGoodman@JustEnergy.com">iGoodman@JustEnergy.com</a>
47	Liberty Power Delaware, LLC	Tabitha Canty	<a href="mailto:TCanty@LibertyPowerCorp.com">TCanty@LibertyPowerCorp.com</a>
48	Liberty Power Holdings, LLC	Garson Knapp	<a href="mailto:gknapp@libertypowercorp.com">gknapp@libertypowercorp.com</a>
49	Palmco Power CA	Laura Salvesen	<a href="mailto:Compliance@PalmcoEnergy.com">Compliance@PalmcoEnergy.com</a>
50	Pilot Power Group, Inc.	Thomas R. Darton	<a href="mailto:TDarton@PilotPowerGroup.com">TDarton@PilotPowerGroup.com</a>
51	Praxair Plainfield, Inc.	Christian Lenci	<a href="mailto:Christian_Lenci@Praxair.com">Christian_Lenci@Praxair.com</a>
52	Shell Energy North America	John W. Leslie, Esq.	<a href="mailto:John.Leslie@dentons.com">John.Leslie@dentons.com</a>
53	Tenaska Power Services Co.	Curry Aldridge	<a href="mailto:CAldridge@tnsk.com">CAldridge@tnsk.com</a>
54	University of California Regents	Mark Byron	<a href="mailto:Mark.Byron@ucop.edu">Mark.Byron@ucop.edu</a>
55	Tiger Natural Gas, Inc.	Bethany Soler	<a href="mailto:bsoler@tigernaturalgas.com">bsoler@tigernaturalgas.com</a>
56	YEP Energy	Kevin Boudreaux	<a href="mailto:KB@EnerCalUSA.com">KB@EnerCalUSA.com</a>
<b>Electric Cooperatives</b>			
57	Anza Electric Cooperative	Kevin Short	<a href="mailto:KevinS@AnzaElectric.org">KevinS@AnzaElectric.org</a>
58	Plumas Sierra Rural Electric Cooperative	Corby Erwin	<a href="mailto:CErwin@PSREC.coop">CErwin@PSREC.coop</a>
59	Surprise Valley Electrification Corporation	Jane Eaton	<a href="mailto:JaneSVEC@Frontier.com">JaneSVEC@Frontier.com</a>
60	Valley Electric Association	S. Bradley Van Cleve	<a href="mailto:mail@dvclaw.com">mail@dvclaw.com</a>

(END OF ATTACHMENT A)